



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/656,687	09/05/2003	James Alfred Thompson	17065/004001	8553
22511 7590 08/21/2008 OSHA LIANG L.L.P. 1221 MCKINNEY STREET SUITE 2800 HOUSTON, TX 77010				
EXAMINER				
MENDOZA, JUNIOR O				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2623				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
08/21/2008		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docketing@oshaliang.com
buta@oshaliang.com

Office Action Summary**Application No.**

10/656,687

Applicant(s)

THOMPSON, JAMES ALFRED

Examiner

JUNIOR O. MENDOZA

Art Unit

2623

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 April 2008.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-39 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-39 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 09/05/2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/CD/CD)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. **Claims 1 – 7, 9, 10, 12, 13, 15, 19 – 23, 25 – 26, 30, 33, 35 – 37 and 39** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wheeler et al. (Pub No US 2004/0128508) in view of Ward (Patent No US 6,195,242). Hereinafter, referenced as Wheeler and Ward, respectively.

Regarding **claim 1**, Wheeler discloses an authentication device obtaining authentication information from an authentication medium (Paragraph [0022]; fig 10);
and an access control system operatively connected to an access administration system granting access to a restricted area when the authentication information is verified (Paragraph [0095]; fig 10),
wherein the access administration system operatively connected to the authentication device for verifying the authentication information (Paragraph [0095]; fig 10) and collecting work log data (Paragraph [0077]; fig 10).

However, it is noted that Wheeler fails to explicitly disclose that the restricted area is a cable distribution box and an access control system grants access to the cable distribution box.

Nevertheless, in a similar field of endeavor Ward discloses that the restricted area is a cable distribution box and an access control system grants access to the cable distribution box (Col. 2 lines 19-67; fig 1).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Wheeler by specifically providing the elements mentioned above, as taught by Ward, for the purpose of unifying two well known technologies which discourages the theft of cable services, allowing companies to protect their product more efficiently.

Regarding **claim 2**, Wheeler and Ward discloses the cable distribution box of claim 1; moreover, Wheeler discloses a lock operatively connected to the access control system unlocking the cable distribution box when access to the cable distribution box has been granted (Paragraph [0095] also exhibited on fig 10).

Regarding **claim 3**, Wheeler and Ward discloses the cable distribution box of claim 1; moreover, Wheeler discloses a communication device operatively connected to the access control system providing communication services between the access control system and the access administration system (Paragraph [0059] fig 10).

Regarding **claim 4**, Wheeler and Ward discloses the cable distribution box of claim 1; moreover, Wheeler discloses that the communication device is at least one selected from the group consisting of a communication adapter and a cable modem (Paragraph [0059] also exhibited on fig 10; communication medium is the internet, where the internet implements modems for communication).

Regarding **claim 5**, Wheeler and Ward discloses the cable distribution box of claim 1; moreover, Wheeler discloses that the access administration system comprises at least one selected from the group consisting of access administration hardware, access administration software, and firmware (Access authentication component [16], paragraph [0095] also exhibited on fig 10).

Regarding **claim 6**, Wheeler and Ward discloses the cable distribution box of claim 1; moreover, Wheeler discloses that the access control system comprises at least one selected from the group consisting of access control software, access control hardware, and firmware (Requesting entity [12] gains access through card reader [224], paragraph [0095] also exhibited on fig 10).

Regarding **claim 7**, Wheeler and Ward discloses the cable distribution box of claim 1; moreover, Wheeler discloses that the authentication device is a card reader and the authentication medium is an access card (Requesting entity [12] gains access through card reader [224] by presenting card [22], paragraph [0095] fig 10).

Regarding **claim 9**, Wheeler and Ward discloses the cable distribution box of claim 1; moreover, Wheeler discloses that the access administration system collects the authentication information (Paragraphs [0088] [0094] [0095] fig 10).

Regarding **claim 10**, Wheeler and Ward discloses the cable distribution box of claim 1; moreover, Wheeler discloses that the access administration system generates a work log from the authentication information and the work log data (Paragraphs [0088] [0094] [0095] fig 10).

Regarding **claim 12**, Wheeler and Ward discloses the cable distribution box of claim 1; moreover, Wheeler discloses that the access administration system verifies the authentication information using a request-response authentication method (Paragraph [0008]; refer to claim 6 of the reference).

Regarding **claim 13**, Wheeler and Ward discloses the cable distribution box of claim 1; moreover, Wheeler discloses that the access administration system verifies the authentication information using a challenge-response authentication method (Paragraph [0086]; the authentication factors of the system [160] requires knowledge of secret confidential information such as a PIN number).

Regarding **claim 15**, Wheeler and Ward discloses the cable distribution box of claim 1; moreover, Wheeler discloses that communication between the access administration system and the access control system is encrypted (Transmission of personal information requires encryption, paragraph [0012]).

Regarding **claim 19**, Wheeler discloses an authentication device obtaining authentication information from an authentication medium (Paragraph [0022]; fig 10);
and an access control system operatively connected to an access administration system granting access to a restricted area when the authentication information is verified (Paragraph [0095]; fig 10),
a memory operatively connected to the authentication device comprising verification information and work log data (Paragraph [0095]; fig 10)
and an access control system operatively connected to the authentication device and the memory, using the verification information and the authentication information to determine whether to grant access to the restricted area (Paragraphs [0077] [0095]; also exhibited on figure 10).

However, it is noted that Wheeler fails to explicitly disclose that the restricted area is a cable distribution box and an access control system which grants access to the cable distribution box.

Nevertheless, in a similar field of endeavor Ward discloses that the restricted area is a cable distribution box and an access control system which grants access to the cable distribution box (Col. 2 lines 19-67; fig 1).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Wheeler by specifically providing the elements mentioned above, as taught by Ward, for the purpose of unifying two well known technologies which discourages the theft of cable services, allowing companies to protect their product more efficiently.

Regarding **claims 20, 21, 22, 23, 25, and 26**, Wheeler and Ward disclose all the limitations of claims 20, 21, 22, 23, 25, and 26; therefore, claims 20, 21, 22, 23, 25, and 26 are rejected for the same reasons as in claims 2, 7, 9, 10, 12 and 13, respectively.

Regarding **claim 30**, Wheeler discloses a method for accessing a restricted area, comprising: obtaining authentication information from an authentication medium (Paragraph [0022]; fig 10);

sending an access request to an access administration system, wherein the access request comprises the authentication information (Paragraph [0059] also exhibited on fig 10);

verifying the access request (Paragraph [0095] also exhibited on fig 10);

generating a work log associated with the access request (Paragraph [0077] also exhibited on fig 10);

and granting access to the restricted area if the access request is verified (Paragraph [0095], also exhibited on fig 10).

However, it is noted that Wheeler fails to explicitly disclose that the restricted area is a cable distribution box and an access control system which grants access to the cable distribution box.

Nevertheless, in a similar field of endeavor Ward discloses that the restricted area is a cable distribution box and an access control system which grants access to the cable distribution box (Col. 2 lines 19-67; fig 1).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Wheeler by specifically providing the elements mentioned above, as taught by Ward, for the purpose of unifying two well known technologies which discourages the theft of cable services, allowing companies to protect their product more efficiently.

Regarding **claims 33, 35 and 37**, Wheeler and Ward disclose all the limitations of claims 33, 35 and 37; therefore, claims 33, 35 and 37 are rejected for the same reasons as in claims 2, 5 and 6, respectively.

Regarding **claim 36**, Wheeler and Ward discloses the cable distribution box of claim 1; moreover, Wheeler discloses that the access to the cable distribution box is granted by an access control system (Paragraph [0095]; fig 10).

Regarding **claim 39**, Wheeler discloses an apparatus for accessing a restricted area, comprising: means for obtaining authentication information from an authentication medium (Paragraph [0022]; fig 10);

means for sending an access request to an access administration system, wherein the access request comprises the authentication information (Paragraph [0095]; fig 10);

means for verifying the access request; means for generating a work log associated with the access request (Paragraphs [0077] [0095]; figure 10).

and means for granting access to the restricted area if the access request is verified (Paragraphs [0077] [0095]; also exhibited on figure 10).

However, it is noted that Wheeler fails to explicitly disclose that the restricted area is a cable distribution box and an access control system which grants access to the cable distribution box.

Nevertheless, in a similar field of endeavor Ward discloses that the restricted area is a cable distribution box and an access control system which grants access to the cable distribution box (Col. 2 lines 19-67; fig 1).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Wheeler by specifically providing the elements mentioned above, as taught by Ward, for the purpose of unifying two well known technologies which discourages the theft of cable services, allowing companies to protect their product more efficiently.

3. **Claim 8** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wheeler in view of Ward further in view of Harold et al. (Patent No US 6,472,973). Hereinafter referenced as Harold.

Regarding **claim 8**, Wheeler and Ward discloses the cable distribution box of claim 7; moreover, Wheeler discloses an access administration system (Paragraph [0095] also exhibited on fig 10).

However, it is noted that Wheeler and Ward fail to explicitly disclose that the access administration system includes functionality to disable the access card.

Nevertheless, in a similar field of endeavor Harold discloses that the access administration system includes functionality to disable the access card (Column 5 lines 24-26).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Wheeler and Ward by specifically providing the elements mentioned above, as taught by Harold, for the purpose of avoiding access of unwanted people to the cable box, where disabling the card is a fast and efficient way to do so.

4. **Claims 11, 24, 31 and 32** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wheeler in view of Ward further in view of Naidoo et al. (Pub No US 2002/0147982). Hereinafter referenced as Naidoo.

Regarding **claim 11**, Wheeler and Ward discloses the cable distribution box of claim 10; moreover, Wheeler discloses that the access administration system includes functionality to analyze the access action to determine whether a response is required (Paragraph [0081]).

However, it is noted that Wheeler and Ward fail to explicitly disclose the functionality to send an alert to an appropriate entity if the response is required.

Nevertheless, in a similar field of endeavor Naidoo discloses the functionality to send an alert to an appropriate entity if the response is required (Paragraph [0076]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Wheeler and Ward by specifically providing such element, as taught by Naidoo, for the purpose of notifying the company and the police about a possible unauthorized access to the cable box, in order to take action as soon as possible increasing the chances to catch the criminal.

Regarding **claim 24**, Wheeler, Ward and Naidoo disclose all the limitations of claim 24; therefore, claim 24 is rejected for the same reasons as in claim 11.

Regarding **claim 31**, Wheeler and Ward discloses the method of claim 30; moreover, Wheeler discloses uploading the work log to the access administration system (Paragraphs [0059] [0077]);

analyzing the work log to determine whether a response is required (Paragraph [0081]).

However, it is noted that Wheeler and Ward fail to explicitly disclose sending an alert to an appropriate entity if the response is required.

Nevertheless, in a similar field of endeavor Naidoo discloses sending an alert to an appropriate entity if the response is required (Paragraph [0076]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Wheeler and Ward by specifically providing such element, as taught by Naidoo, for the purpose of notifying the company and the police about a possible unauthorized access to the cable box, in order to take action as soon as possible increasing the chances to catch the criminal.

Regarding **claim 32**, Wheeler and Ward discloses the method of claim 30; moreover, however, it is noted that Wheeler and Ward fail to explicitly disclose continuously monitoring the restricted area to determine the status.

Nevertheless, in a similar field of endeavor Naidoo discloses continuously monitoring the cable distribution box to determine the status (Paragraph [0016]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Wheeler and Ward by specifically providing

such element, as taught by Naidoo, for the purpose of keeping control at all times of who has access to the restricted area.

5. **Claims 14, 27 and 34** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wheeler in view of Ward further in view of Rowe (Pub No US 2004/0050930). Hereinafter referenced as Rowe.

Regarding **claim 14**, Wheeler and Ward discloses the cable distribution box of claim 1; moreover, Wheeler discloses that communication data is encrypted (Paragraphs [0009] [0012]).

However, it is noted that Wheeler and Ward fail to explicitly disclose that communication between the authentication device and the access control system is encrypted.

Nevertheless, in a similar field of endeavor Rowe discloses that communication between the authentication device and the access control system is encrypted (Paragraph [0002] [0031]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Wheeler and Ward by specifically providing such element, as taught by Rowe, for the purpose of providing a high level of security which decreases the chances for private data to be stolen.

Regarding **claims 27 and 34**, Wheeler, Ward and Rowe disclose all the limitations of claims 27 and 34; therefore, claims 27 and 34 are rejected for the same reasons as in claim 14.

6. **Claims 16, 17 18, 28, 29 and 38** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wheeler in view of Ward further in view of Rich et al. (Pub No US 2004/0071382). Hereinafter referenced as Rich.

Regarding **claim 16**, Wheeler and Ward discloses the cable distribution box of claim 1; moreover, Wheeler discloses an authentication device, the access administration system, and the access control system (Paragraphs [0077] [0095] also exhibited on figure 10).

However, it is noted that Wheeler and Ward fail to explicitly disclose that the components are powered using current obtained from a cable line operatively connected to the cable distribution box.

Nevertheless, in a similar field of endeavor Rich discloses that the components are powered using current obtained from a cable line operatively connected to the cable distribution box (Paragraphs [0011] - [0013]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Wheeler and Ward by specifically providing such element, as taught by Rich, for the purpose of eliminating the need to include two

Art Unit: 2623

or more different set of cables, for data transmission and for providing power, which saves money.

Regarding **claim 17**, Wheeler and Ward discloses the cable distribution box of claim 2; moreover, Wheeler discloses a lock (Paragraphs [0077] [0095] also exhibited on figure 10).

However, it is noted that Wheeler and Ward fail to explicitly disclose that the components are powered using current obtained from a cable line operatively connected to the cable distribution box.

Nevertheless, in a similar field of endeavor Rich discloses that the components are powered using current obtained from a cable line operatively connected to the cable distribution box (Paragraphs [0011] - [0013]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Wheeler and Ward by specifically providing such element, as taught by Rich, for the purpose of eliminating the need to include two or more different set of cables, for data transmission and for providing power, which saves money.

Regarding **claim 18**, Wheeler and Ward discloses the cable distribution box of claim 3; moreover, Wheeler discloses a communication device (Paragraphs [0077] [0095] also exhibited on figure 10).

However, it is noted that Wheeler and Ward fail to explicitly disclose that the components are powered using current obtained from a cable line operatively connected to the cable distribution box.

Nevertheless, in a similar field of endeavor Rich discloses that the components are powered using current obtained from a cable line operatively connected to the cable distribution box (Paragraphs [0011] - [0013]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Wheeler and Ward by specifically providing such element, as taught by Rich, for the purpose of eliminating the need to include two or more different set of cables, for data transmission and for providing power, which saves money.

Regarding **claims 28 and 29**, Wheeler and Ward disclose all the limitations of claims 28 and 29; therefore, claims 28 and 29 are rejected for the same reasons as in claims 16 and 17, respectively.

Regarding **claim 38**, Wheeler and Ward disclose all the limitations of claim 38; therefore, claim 38 is rejected for the same reasons as in claim 16.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JUNIOR O. MENDOZA whose telephone number is (571)270-3573. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 9am - 5pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Koenig can be reached on (571)272-7296. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Junior O Mendoza
Examiner
Art Unit 2623

/J. O. M./
August 6, 2008

/Andrew Y Koenig/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2623

